

-23-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 21, 2005, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claim(s) 1-84 are now pending in this Application.

In this Amendment, claim(s) 1, 6, 7, 26, 38, 39, 61 have been amended, claim(s) 5, 37, 74 have been cancelled, and claim(s) 85-88 have been added.

Claim(s) 1, 26, 61, 85 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

The Office Action indicates informalities with the Drawings. Accordingly, submitted herewith are revised formal drawings. Acceptance of these revised drawings is requested.

Claims 1-84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Abu-Samaha, U.S. Patent No. 6,938,087 (Abu-Samaha '087). The Office Action suggests that Abu-Samaha '087 teaches a system for receiving a service call in any format and delivering it to the destination in appropriate format. Applicants respectfully disagree with these contentions and assert that the present claimed invention is not anticipated by any disclosure in the Abu-Samaha '087 references.

In particular, the Office Action rejects claim 1, suggesting that Abu-Samaha teaches a uniform media format (UMF). The cited sections of Abu-Samaha (4:36-5:21) disclose an instance of a universal communications module 20. As clarified at page 7:25-28, and with respect to Fig. 5, such a universal communications module 20 operates in conjunction with a service module 10. Further, as clarified at col. 8:57-60, such a service module is an executable code

-24-

fragment operable to provide service deliverables while in communication with the universal communications object 20.

Accordingly, the cited service module 10 is operable for communication between an origination device 104 and a destination device 106 (7:42-43) for pass through communication, as shown by the access and destination presentation bars in Fig. 5. Abu-Samaha does not show, teach, or disclose converting a received message into an intermediate uniform media format, as claimed in claim 1. In contrast, claim 1 recites a method that:

- receives a message via a communications channel;
- converts said message into a uniform media format; and
- converts said uniform media formatted message for at least one communications protocol

The cited art makes no showing, teaching, or suggestion of a conversion to an intermediate uniform media format operable to, for example, be stored in a database and converted to a plurality of formats depending on the destination recipients, discussed further below. Such a uniform media format differs from the access, or origination format and destination format shown in Abu-Samaha '087 because the claimed uniform media format is independent of the receipt and delivery protocols. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 is improper and it is requested that it be withdrawn.

Further, with respect to claims 8 and 14, claim 8 specifically recites storing the uniform media formatted message in a database, and claim 14 recites maintaining the uniform media formatted message in a database. The Office action cites Col. 5:58-65 in support of this assertion. However, the cited portions refer to service module 10 processing with respect to pushing and pulling message traffic, and make no showing, teaching, or suggestion, alone or in combination, of writing or storing message traffic in a database. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 8 is improper and it is requested that it be withdrawn. Further, claim 87 has been herein added, depending from claim 1, to clarify the subject matter of claim 8 by reciting that converting to the uniform media format is independent of each of the at least one communications

protocol (i.e. the source and destination message formats). Claim 88 has further been added, including subject matter of claim 14, to recite that the uniform media format [is] independent of the first communications protocol and the second communications protocol. Claim 87 therefore recites features similar to claim 8 as filed including the above amendment, and claim 88 is similar to claim 14 as filed including the above amendment, to further clarify and distinguish configurations of Applicant's claimed invention.

The Office Action rejects claim 5. With respect to claim 5, the Office Action suggests that Abu-Samaha '087 teaches accessing a database containing contact profile and user contact information. The cited sections of Abu-Samaha (col. 6:36-66), in contrast, discuss accessing the operating system (OS) resident services for accessing boot and configuration parameters, system settings, and user settings (e.g. the windows registry database, as is known to those of skill in the art). Such OS resident functions are for accessing local users known to the local node, and not for obtaining information about remote recipients and destinations, such as user preferences indicative of preferable devices and protocols in an prioritized manner, as discussed further at page 12:24-13:18. Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claim 5, and claim 5 cancelled, to further clarify accessing the databases of contact profile and location information, and user preference information. Further, claims 6 and 7, depending from claim 5, further recite receiving the contact profile and location information, as discussed further at page 13:2-18. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 and claims 6-7 are therefore allowable.

The Office Action further rejects claim 14 based on the disclosure at Col. 4:35-5:57. The cited reference teaches service modules 10, which are instantiated in conjunction with universal communications modules 20. However, each of the service modules 10 is operable for a specific task: e.g. "server computer 30 initiates one or more service modules 10 to produce the requested service deliverables" [5:33-35]). A "service deliverable" is "the results of push services processing, pull services processing or transaction services processing"

(5:58-60). However, the service modules 10 differ from the method claimed in claim 14 because the service modules are specific to a particular service or protocol requested. Therefore, as indicated in Fig. 5, a service module 10 instantiation as a server object 100 is required for each "service deliverable" to be "pushed, pulled or processed." In contrast, the claimed first and second communication channels are accessible and operable by receipt transport agents (RTAs 230) and delivery transport agents (DTAs 290) responsive to the core message module 250, as described at page 11:22-26 and 12:21-25 and shown in Fig. 3.

Unlike specific instantiations of service modules 10, the claimed core message module 250 has available each of the DTAs and RTAs, each conversant in the uniform media format, for receiving various types of traffic via the incoming channels, operable to perform processing according to the core message modules, and transporting via one or more of the DTAs, again via the corresponding channel to the recipient. No specific selection or instantiation of individual service modules need be performed. In contrast, in the Abu-Samaha system, a separate service module 10 would need to be instantiated for each communications protocol for which the message was to be delivered. Accordingly, Abu-Samaha '087 does not show, teach or disclose the claimed determining whether said message formatted for a first communications protocol has been delivered via a first communications channel because in Abu-Samaha determination of a particular protocol occurs before the instantiation of a service module to handle that protocol- the service modules 10 are protocol specific.

Further, as indicated above, Abu-Samaha does not show, teach, or disclose, alone or in combination, maintaining a copy of said uniform media formatted message within a database, and delivering the same message in first and second communications protocols to first and second communication channels as in claim 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is allowable. Further, claim 61, reciting subject matter similar to claim 1, has been

-27-

herein amended with claim 74, reciting features similar to original claims 1 and 14, to further clarify and distinguish applicant's claimed invention.

Further, the office action rejects claim 20. Claim 20 recites a delivery transport agent operable to convert the uniform media formatted message into a communications protocol and forward said message formatted in said communications protocol to said identified at least one user communications device. As indicated above, the claimed delivery transport agents 290 are responsive to a core messaging module 250 operable to retrieve uniform media formatted messages and deliver them to a plurality of recipients, as claimed in claim 19. Further, the Office Action further rejects claim 15 based on the same sections of Abu-Samaha. Claim 15 recites, inter alias, first and second communications channels and converting the uniform media formatted message for each of the respective communication channels. Accordingly, claim 85 has been herein added, reciting subject matter of claims 1, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 20, to further clarify claimed configurations of applicants' invention.

Further, claim 86 has been herein added, depending from claim 85, including subject matter of claim 16, to further clarify and distinguish the disclosed method. Abu-Samaha makes no showing, teaching, or disclosure of the claimed virtual session or of the use of such a session with an instant messaging protocol, as recited in claim 86 and discussed in the specification at page 36:9-19.

With respect to claims 26-60, the Office Action summarily dismisses these claims as duplicative of claims 1-25. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not state the ground of rejection fully and clearly as required by MPEP 707.07(d). The set of claims in 26-60, while embodying system claims, is neither parallel nor duplicative of the method recited in claims 1-25. For example, claim 26 recites a receiving transport agent, at least one core messaging module and at least one delivery transport agent. These elements do not share a substantial correspondence to the elements of claim 1 to from which the office action suggests they relate, specifically receiving, converting,

-28-

identifying, converting and forwarding. Further, the other claims in the claim set 26-60 do not share a sufficient correspondence to claims 1-25 to validate such a blanket rejection. By way of further example, claims 34-36 recites a carrier knowledge module, a carrier knowledge database, and a carrier management queue. There is no recitation of any carrier management features in the claim set 1-25. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that these first rejections were improperly made and that therefore applicant is entitled to further respond to rejections of claims 26-60 before any subsequent rejection is made final.

Further, to the extent that applicant's representative can construe corresponding subject matter in claims 26-60, applicant refers to claim 37. Claim 37 recites "a message store database operable to store....said uniform media formatted message". For the reasons cited above with respect to claims 1 and 8, claim 26 has been herein amended with the subject matter of claim 37, to further clarify and distinguish applicant's claimed invention.

As the remaining claims 2-3, 6-25, 27-36, 38-60, 62-73, 75-84 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 26 and 61, which by the foregoing are deemed allowable, it is respectfully requested that the case be allowed and passed to issue.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-29-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: NMS06-04

Dated: February 21, 2006